DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 693 PS 010 457

AUTHOR Baer, Neal A.
TITLE The Dynamics of Work and Play: An Historical Analysis and Future Implications.
PUB DATE Feb 79
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Changing Attitudes; *Classroom Environment; Classroom Techniques; *Early Childhood Education; *Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Innovation; *Learning; Permissive Environment; *Play; Social Attitudes; *Social Values; Theories

ABSTRACT

This paper traces selected sociological, anthropological and psychological interpretations of work and play and their implications for classroom practice. Conflict theorists' views of the impact of industrialization on the family and the school and the increasing separation of the worlds of play and work are counterposed to functionalist models of schooling as social integration and socialization. Research which tests the theory of education as social reproduction of class differences is discussed. The emergent role of specialists in the helping professions and their reform of educational practice, core ideas of neo-Freudian perspectives, and anthropological theory and research on play and schooling are briefly reviewed. It is noted that while the dynamics of work and play in the classroom remain largely unexplored, the traditional dichotomy between work and play is unsound. An instructional sequence of play, work and more play, which begins in loosely structured, highly motivating messing around, moves to disciplined, directed and productive work and flows into playful, creative release, is advocated. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168693

THE DYNAMICS OF WORK AND PLAY:

AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

Neal A. Baer

Harvard Graduate School
of Education

February 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Neal A. Baer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS010457

"Man is perfectly human only when he plays," said Schiller, and this thought may also pertain to children at play in their classrooms. But what is this seemingly simple activity that constitutes play and allows for the expression of the qualities and attributes that make us wholly human? And how, then, does play's counterpart, work, fit into the schema of activities found in the classroom? These questions serve as a broad framework which can be used to help focus an analysis of the dynamics of work and play in the classroom. In order to approach these questions coherently and with insight, it is necessary to trace the historical development of these two processes using various theoretical lenses that will serve to clarify the many factors influencing work and play in the classroom today. Therefore, I will present a sociological, anthropological, and psychological interpretation of the development of work and play in the classroom culminating in a definition that weaves these theoretical interpretations together, which, in turn, illuminates and heightens our understanding of these two activities that compose the basic structure of the classroom. Finally, I will argue that a clear understanding of the dynamics of work and play leading to their fusion may result in the formation and operation of a more holistic and healthy classroom atmosphere that promotes cultural and individual integrity, respect among classroom participants, the exploration of new ideas, and the blossoming and nurturance of creativity.

Interest in the relationship between work and play and their expression in the classroom is not novel as discussion extends from the present to at least as far back as Aristotle. Aristotle identified

play with leisure and saw them as a respite from work, although he did not equate leisure with inactivity. In addition, he believed "we must do our leisure in some activity, but that activity must be something of intrinsic value."[1] This classical view of play as a non-goal oriented activity performed for its intrinsic value, as opposed to work, which is done for its extrinsic rewards and has its aim in the production of some service or commodity, is echoed continuously throughout history, especially with the onset of the Industrial Revolution where work and play undergo a profound separation. A point of clarification is necessary to show how an activity may be "done for its intrinsic value." It seems impossible, in an objective sense, to perform any activity for its own sake when that activity "...seems to require the conscious adoption of a certain achievement as its purpose"[2] as is the case, for instance, in dance where one tries to achieve as an end lithe movement and coordination. Nevertheless one can still enjoy dancing even if one cannot master the technique. When dance is viewed subjectively, however, "different ways of relating to the purpose of that activity are possible. One can relate to that purpose simply as the means to some further purpose, or one can relate to it in such a way that the activity is done for its own sake only. The difference...has to do not so much with the character of the activity itself as with the character of the person who is engaged in it."[3] Therefore, in order for an activity to be called play in the classical sense, the activity must be approached with a particular attitude that permits it to be performed for its own sake. During the Progressive Movement in Education, in the early part of the twentieth century, this classical notion of play will be reiterated and also reinterpreted within the context of a corporate capitalist economic system.

In agrarian America play and work were interlocking spheres of activity that found their expression within the family. Christopher Lasch, in his book Haven in a Heartless World, details the meaning work had for the family in pre-industrial America. Lasch views work and play as enmeshed; the fruits of labor were prized not only for their extrinsic value, but for the intrinsic sense of accomplishment they gave to the worker. Education, like work and play, was an activity carried out within the family (except for the very wealthy) that had specific aims both explicit and implicit. Education had as its explicit aim the instruction of the young in the techniques and rudiments necessary for survival. The child learned the skills required for work and practiced these skills as he or she learned them. In this context, education may be seen as work because it had specific goals and was expressed in the form of production as the child practiced the domestic and agrarian skills he or she was taught. In another sense, however, a child's education was the instruction in the culture and traditions of the family and community. The family was the foremost agency of socialization and education was the the process by which the children were socialized. Education, then, had a variety of functions in colonial and agrarian America, and it may seen as encompassing both work and a process of socialization.[4]

The coming of the Industrial Revolution not only took work out of the home, but it also changed the manner in which the child was to be educated.

> Some other agency had therefore to take on their (the family's) educative functions, and it had become almost a folk assumption that this agency should be the school. Public schooling then tended to become coextensive with education of the public, and it has since become increasingly difficult for us to separate our understanding of education from the quite different matter of our understanding of schooling.5

The school began to take on some of the roles which had been previously

delegated to the family. The greater demands placed upon the parents' time due to industrialization, required that a new institution share in the family's socialization responsibilities. This shift from work inside the home to the factory created changes in the way people viewed work, play, and education.

> Industrialization made urgent the formation of a disciplined, reliable, full-time labor force. As the mechanized factory system gained in importance, what was needed was the segregation of work and play, production and idleness, work-time and free-time...Despite the growing differentiation between work-time and free-time, worker communities managed to sustain many of their playful characteristics in the form of leisure activities. Accordingly, programs of worker discipline expanded in scope... Play was now associated with idleness and regarded as an obstacle to both a reliably obedient and productive work force and sustained industrial and economic growth.6

This enlarging chasm between work and play had a profound impact upon the family and the way it related to the outside world. No longer was the line between work and play blurred as work was taken out from the family's domain.

The separation between work and play not only affected the family, but it created educational reform in the fashion of large urban schools that tried to inculcate values concommitant with those in the workplace.

> In the 1840s, several organizations designed for introducing socially acceptable ways for children to spend their leisure time developed with the specific intent to inculcate in working class children the middle class virtues of self-discipline, delayed gratification, and punctuality. During this period educational reform became paramount and, not surprisingly, the wide appeal of this reform rested largely on its denunciation of working class cultural decadence and immaturity...The proponents of educational reform promised to save the children from the barbarities of the working class community, to bestow upon them proper bourgeois manners and aspirations, and by so doing, to expand the markets and to pacify the labor force. An effective system of national education would insure that free-time would not be wasted in idle play.7

The development of corporate capitalism required that work and play

be disconnected, and the development of schooling mirrored this change by inculcating attitudes and behaviors in the children that would best serve the smooth running of the wider society.

> As a result, the schools' culture became closely identified with the ethos of the corporate workplace. Schooling came to be seen as work or the preparation for work; schools were pictured as factories, educators as industrial managers, and students as the raw materials to be inducted into the production process.8

A careful analysis of this relationship between the schools and the workplace is necessary as this identification serves as the foundation of sociological investigation for such theorists as Bowles, Gintis, Carnoy, Levin, and others. Christopher Lasch sees the specialization and fragmentation of work as leading to profound changes in play and education.

> As production became more complex and efficient, work became increasingly specialized, fragmented, and routine. Accordingly, work came to be seen as merely a means to an end...No longer regarded as a satisfying occupation in its own right, work had to be redefined as a way of achieving satisfaction or consolation outside work. Production, in this view, is interesting and important only because it enables us to enjoy the delights of consumption. At a deeper level of mystification, social labor--the collective self-realization of mankind through its transformation of nature--appears merely as the satisfaction of private wants...The products of human activity, especially the higher products of that activity such as the social order itself took on the appearance of something external and alien to mankind. No longer recognizably the product of human invention, the man-made world appeared as a collection of objects independent of human intervention and control. Having objectified himself in his work, man no longer recognized it as his own.9

This neo-Marxist critique of production and its effect upon the worker is useful because it clarifies the meaning play aquired. No longer was play to be performed for the sake of its intrinsic value. The alienation of the workers from their work together with the boredom they experienced on the job caused play to become synonymous with consumption. In this sense, play becomes work as its goal becomes the extrinsic satisfaction of the desires created by the alienating

system of production.

Cohen and Lazerson, in their article "Education and the Corporate Order," enlarge upon this notion of the schools' function in the late nineteenth century and onward as the preparation for economic productivity. In order for workers to be trained for their work as well as complacent and accepting of the hardships and alienation of factory life, Cohen and Lazerson posit the view that the schools became training camps where "classroom activities...inculcate(d) the values thought to make good industrial workers--respect for authority, discipline, order, cleanliness and punctuality..."[10] Thus, the schools become work oriented; curriculum and other class activities were directed towards the goal of producing good workers. Within this system of schooling, play had no place.

The notion that schools were microcosms of the working world finds its expression in both functionalist and conflict sociological theory. Bowles and Gintis argue that the social relations of production in the workplace are reproduced in the classroom in order that the capitalist interests in control over production may remain intact.

> Bowles and Gintis point to position in the authority structure at the workplace as the source of differing values constitutive of class sub-cultures...(They) look at the values of the middle class as 'internalized norms' reflecting the demands of their positions in the hierarchy of production. Membership in these sub-cultures serves to provide children of varying social class backgrounds with values and personality traits appropriate to future positions in the hierarchical division of labor roughly commensurate with their social origins. The educational system, both through class-linked inequality of academic success and through differential socialization by social class, reinforces inequalities based on the production process.[11]

Since the development of corporate capitalism in the US, Bowles and Gintis see the school as the institution that serves to replicate the division of labor and hierarchical structure of the workplace.

Work in school then comes to be seen as both cultural hegemony and directed towards the reproduction of class and status differences. Finally, the school becomes identified as a factory, and less attention is paid to the internal nature of the school becuase the factory metaphor speciously appears to define the process of work in the classroom. Ralph Miller, in his article "The Dubious Case for Metaphors," argues that Bowles' and Gintis' identification of the school as a factory with work in the classroom taking on the connotation of the assembly line is a gross exaggeration and distortion of work in the schools.

> The factory metaphor is persuasive because it proceeds from simple points of correspondence: factories and schools both have inputs and outputs, there is processing in both places, and pupils do move from subject to subject...The implication is that schools are mechanical, that they 'stamp out' individuality, that they prepare students to fit into the system. These imprecise comments about schools are loaded with feeling.12

While this macroscopic interpretation of work and its replication in the classroom is valuable because it connects the process of schoolin to the wider society, it neglects the internal dynamics of the individual classroom with its melange of different cultures, expectations, and attitudes.

Another sociological interpretation of work in the school, which relies heavily on Marxist conflict theory, is espoused by Carnoy and Levin in their book The Limits of Educational Reform where they utilize Bowles' and Gintis' theory of reproduction and expand upon it with their own theories of correspondence and contradiction. Carnoy and Levin see the school corresponding to the workplace through its curriculum and socialization of the students.

> Thus the schooling process mediates incipient contradictions in the labor process by replicating the relations to peers, authority figures, knowledge, and control over work content that students will subsequently face in their work

> lives...The relations within college, graduate school and their preparatory tracks attended by upper SES children correspond to relations within the primary creative segment of the labor market. The schooling experience of inner-city youth in grammar school and high school prepare them for the secondary labor market. The relations of high school, and nonelite four-year colleges experienced by middle SES students correspond by and large to the primary routinized segment.13

Again, work in school is seen as a socialization process by which the capitalist mode of production may be perpetuated. "Cognitive factors play quite a minor role in the allocation of individuals to positions in the class structure. More important are the non-cognitive personality factors that are necessary for the proper performance of tasks at a given level in the hierarchy of the social relations of production."[14]

In an attempt to test these macroscopic theories empirically, Wilcox and Moriarty examined two elementary schools, one upper middle class and the other lower middle class, both racially composed by all white student bodies, to ascertain whether these children were treated differently by their teachers to fill various social roles as adults. They found that the teacher in the upper middle class school taught the children to maintain personal responsibility for the quality of their academic work while the teacher in the other classroom expected the children to follow her own external guidelines and rules.

> In schools, the internal/external distinction is reflected in both teacher expectations and the nature of responsibilities given to children...In an internal interaction, the teacher throws the responsibility back to the child to think and shape activity in a manner that promotes or relies upon internalized values, self-images, standards, or goals...By contrast, in an external interaction, the teacher is the one who does the thinking. She treats the child as a person who is expected to follow certain standard rules, procedures or directions laid down by herself and made salient by her authority and direct power.15

Children from upper middle class homes receive internal cues that prepare them to take authority in the workplace while children from lower middle class homes receive external cues that prepare them to take orders. Wilcox and Moriarty believe this differential socialization is due to the "pervasive stereotyping fostered by everyday social experiences that constantly recognizes and draws conclusions from social class status."[16] This study is admirable because it attempts to apply empirical data to macroscopic conflict theories that do not easily lend themselves to empirical analysis. Unfortunately, the study is limited to two schools and the nature of the work within the schools is never described. Thus, further study must be done along these lines to lend credence to this theoretical description of the relationship between work in school and in the workplace.

In contrast to the macroscopic conflict theory of education, which has its roots in Marxist and Weberian theory,[17] functionalist theory, as espoused by Parsons and Dreeben, sets the school and workplace in a more democratic atmosphere. Functionalists like Parsons, see the classroom "...as essentially liberating--a place where children can rid themselves of the shackles of sex, family, culture, and race, and can prove themselves anew as achievers or nonachievers."[18] Dreeben expands on this Parsonian model and views the school as the institution that inculcates societal norms and values which maintains an equilibrium and balance within the wider society.[19]

> ...where functionalists have provided a description of the relations existing between the educational system and other social institutions, conflict theorists have put forward an explanation of why these relations exist and how they change over time. Moreover, where functionalists have to look at the socialization process as one of those common values that hold a society together, neo-Marxists and neo-Weberians have examined the interests that underlie

these values and have noticed that socialization differs systematically by social class.20

Neither conflict nor functionalist theory, however, thoroughly explains or describes the internal dynamics of the classroom including the activities of work and play. Conflict theory generalizes that work in the classroom replicates work in the factory while functionalist theory sees work in the classroom as a means of imparting the skills necessary to maintain equilibrium within our sociopolitical system. While conflict theory appears to be a more viable macroscopic description of the process of schooling because it emphasizes the connection between the school and other institutions and goes beyond functionalist "descriptions" and places emphasis upon "explanations, it is anachronistic because it fails to adequately incorporate the Progressive Movement into its theory and it is difficult to extricate it from its factory-based descriptions that better explain the process of work in the early twentieth century before the advent of mass technology. This is not to suggest, however, that a neo-Marxist critique is not valuable, because it clarifies the sometimes murky relationship between the school and the workplace. Yet, when taken as the only explanation, as is the case with Bowles, Gintis, Carnoy, and Levin, much of the dynamics of the internal classroom structure remain woefully unclear.

The development of the corporate capitalist system of production in the early twentieth century saw the influx of management techniques designed to make the workers and the workplace produce at their utmost efficiency. Raymond Callahan, in his book The Cult of Efficiency, describes how school administrators designed the schools to operate at full efficiency. Classrooms were never to remain unutilized, and students, therefore, got their first taste of depart-

mentalized education. One benefit of this new approach was the development of special studies or elective courses which could now be worked into the child's schedule since school time became more highly organized.

> Operating industrial plants at capacity meant increased production and greater profit. Operating schools in this way undoubtedly increased the educational 'production,'...but it is also clear that the economy feature was the primary factor in its appeal. Other schemes which utilized the school facilities more fully but which cost more money were quickly abandoned.21

At first glance, the patterning of the school after the factory seems to echo descriptions found in neo-Marxist conflict theory. There is, however, more to this development than meets the macroscopic eye. Christopher Lasch, in an insightful analysis of the efficiency movement at the workplace, describes how a similar movement took place within the ranks of the helping, service-oriented professions. "With the rise of the 'helping professions' in the first three decades of the twentieth century, society in the guise of a 'nurturing mother' invaded the family...and took over many of its functions."[22] Just as parents felt aliented from the workplace, they soon felt "...unable to provide for their own (familial) needs without the supervision of trained experts."[23] These experts, trained in the rigors of social science and influenced by Freudian theory, began to see the child in a profoundly new manner. Educators saw their job as more than inculcating good worker habits and "...began to stress the child's need for play, for love and understanding, and for the gradual, gentle unfolding of his nature."[24] Play was introduced into schools by educational reformers who felt that the best interests of the child required a curriculum that promoted self-expression, independence, and creativity. In addition, these reformers, armed with new social scientific knowledge, were

able to effect change in classroom work because parents viewed them as experts who knew what was best for their children.

One of these new educational reformers who perhaps had the greatest influence in bringing play into the classroom was John Dewey.

> (He) believed that work and play were part of a continuum, differing only in terms of 'timespan;' and the rigor of commitment to a specified goal. 'In play,' Dewey argued, 'the activity is its own end, instead of having an ulterior result.' Play was, 'free, plastic,' it meant keeping 'alive a creative and constructive attitude.' ...He contended that work in an industrial society, 'especially in cities,' was 'anti-educational,' because it took its definition from the needs of the economy, rather than individual or social needs.25

Thus, play came into the classroom as a result of several phenomena: the notion of efficiency, which separated the parents even further from their children by its cultivation of social science expertise, thereby encouraging educational reformers to decide what was best for children; the new psychological interpretation of the child as espoused by Freud; and Dewey's concern that the classroom should reflect a democratic, rather than paternalistic and dictatorial social order.

The application of Dewey's theories in the classroom took many forms. Some schools allowed children to take full responsibility for the direction of their education free of teacher interference or direction, while other schools reacted with hostility and became even stricter. Richard Hofstadter, in his book Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, clarifies Dewey's theory and argues that Dewey never had in mind an education that was directionless and unguided.

> He (Dewey) often said in his early as well as later educational writings that the child himself, unguided, is not capable of spinning out the proper content of his education; that every superficial act or interest, every stray impulse, of the child is not necessarily valuable;

> that the teacher must somehow, without imposing external ends, guide direct and develop those impulses of the child which are moving forward.[26]

Dewey sees play as a means by which the child could develop his natural "impulses," while work took on the form of the direction of these impulses towards the blossoming of new ways for the child to create a harmonious synthesis of himself with the society. In this sense, play is the activity that nurtures the fertilization of talents and capacities, while work has an external aim, the actual development of these capabilities. Cohen and Lazerson argue along a similar line as Bowles and Gintis, that Dewey's formulation of work and play in the classroom is contradictory to a system built upon corporate capitalism.[27]

Cohen and Lazerson see play as a means of differentiating the labor force in the workplace.[28] Children from upper middle class families "play" more in school, or to be more precise, are allowed more freedom, independence, and responsibility. Play, in this sense, is not play according to Dewey's philosophy because these activities are directed toward some external goal, that is, the maintenance of the corporate capitalist economic system. Therefore, it appears that play in the Deweyian context "...a set of principles for organizing experience, constituted by any activity that is voluntary and openended (i.e., free from both external and internal compulsions), non-instrumental (in the sense that it is pursued for its sake and has as its center of interest process rather than goal); and transcendent of ordinary states of being and consciousness"[29] is virtually nonexistent in the classrooms of the early twentieth century and in classrooms of the present when macroscopic theoretical analysis is used exclusively to describe work and play in the classroom. Every teacher knows, however, examples of play in the

in the classroom, and yet, the preceeding macroscopic analysis identifies any play that may exist as a process which serves to perpetuate the corporate capitalist system. If this analysis is entirely correct, then play, in the context of Dewey's definition, cannot exist. While macroscopic sociological theory provides some clarification of the process of work and play in the classroom based upon their relationship to the wider society, it neglects describing actual classroom behavior and interaction, and in the case of play, may actually espouse an incorrect analysis. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of empirical data that provides a microscopic view of the dynamics of work and play in the classroom.

A sociological perspective of work and play in the classroom has been restricted to a macroscopic analysis by most sociologists, although Dewey and other educational reformers did help to bring play into the classroom. What is needed presently is an empirical study that details the processes of work and play in a variety of different classroom settings.

Perhaps a microscopic sociological analysis of the dynamics of work and play in the classroom might be approached with insight through a brief anthropological and psychological analysis of play. These disciplines may lend insight into the analysis, because they tend to observe individual behaviors and then formulate the observations into broader theories.

Erik Erikson views play as an activity that helps the child to deal with traumatic experiences.

> ...one child after another will use a few toys and ten to twenty minutes time to let some disturbing fact of his life, or some life task, become the basis for a performance characterized by a unique style of representation... true, the themes presented betray some repetitiveness such as we recognize as the 'working through' of a traumatic

> experience: but they also express a playful renewal. If they seem to be governed by some need to communicate, or even to confess, they certainly also seem to serve the joy of self-expression. If they seem dedicated to the exercise of growing faculties, they also seem to serve the mastery of a complex life situation.30

Play, then, helps the child to master reality through experimentation and the direction of self-expression. In this sense, Erikson's definition of play does not differ greatly from Dewey's as they compliment one another in their expression of the child's need to recreate, organize, and finally understand his experiences.

One other important aspect of Erikson's view of play and its expression in the classroom centers on the notion of play as re-invention, or in Piagetian terms, the creation of new cognitive understanding through the interplay of the child's inner resources and the task at hand. [31]

> If, for instance, children must playfully reinvent in order to understand logical and mathematical principles, then it becomes necessary that every public school that does not want to defeat its very purpose give every child a measure of freedom to explore, while protecting him from a barrage of distracting stimuli, including excessive fear and rage...(This) means that all institutionalized child care and education must beware of either anarchy or regimentation. It means that children need teachers with self-discipline but without too many constrictions. Above all else, in order to avoid the poisonlike character of the frightening laissez faire of such institutions there must be a ratio of responsible adults appropriate to the developmental stages of children.32

In this view of play, it is important for the teacher to create a classroom atmosphere that nurtures the orderly expression of what Dewey refers to as the child's "impulses." Freedom of self-expression, in turn, allows the child to develop the cognitive capacities necessary for the interpretation of the principles that compose the complex nature of his environment. Beatrice and John Whiting, however, do not view the school as a nurturing environment. They see schoolwork

as "egoistic and competitive. Academic success is individual, and... competition for good grades is training for egoism and does not encourage a child to consider the needs of others."[33]

The Whitings see the school as emphasizing non-nurturant modes of behavior such as individualism and competition because the wider society demands this behavior of adults. I do not believe, however, that this means that Dewey's and Erikson's notion of play has no place in the classroom. Although school may function as an institution that socializes children to fit into adult roles, it is incorrect to assume as functionalists and conflict theorists do, that this is the school's only role. Perhaps play may be just the activity schools need to stress in order that children may be better able to cope with the alienating and "heartless" world described in the writings of Bowles, Gintis, Carnoy, Levin, and Lasch.

According to the educational philosopher, Thomas Green, "The basic idea of play is activity without result. In play, the object of an activity is the activity itself, not any consequence or result beyond it."[34] This definition of play, which is essentially the same as the classical definition given by Aristotle, when combined with those of Dewey and Erikson, make play an invigorating process that helps the child better come to terms with the wider society. As opposed to work, which is goal oriented and directed toward some tangible product, play is a freeing of the imagination and has no external aims. While work gives us the commodities we need to live in the present, play keeps the future open and alive because it allows for the expression and communication of what Margaret Mead calls "new experiential knowledge." Margaret Mead expresses the need for play, which helps children pose new questions, most eloquently:

> So the freeing of men's imagination from the past depends, I believe, on the development of a new kind of communication with those who are most deeply involved with the future--the young who were born in the new world...the development of prefigurational cultures will depend on the existence of a continuing dialogue in which the young, free to act on their own initiation, can lead their elders in the direction of the unknown. Then the older generation will have access to the new experiential knowledge, without which no meaningful plans can be made. It is only with the direct participation of the young, who have that knowledge, that we can build a viable future...The children, the young, must ask the questions that we would never think to ask, but enough trust must be re-established so that the elders will be permitted to work with them on the answers...35

Play, then, frees the child's mind to explore "new" realities and allows him to construct new relationships from among objects and persons in his environment. Play is the crucial element required to fend off the alienation between people that pervades the school and workplace, because play allows us to use our human capacities to transcend the existing reality and to forge new futures.

What place does play have, then, within the classroom? First, and most important, play and work should not be viewed as dichotomous or mutually exclusive of each other. Play in the classroom acquaints the child with his environment, or as David Hawkins puts it, play is "messing around." It allows the child freedom to direct his "impulses," to interact with his peers, and to physically and mentally explore ideas.

> ...there must be a stronger expression of the play element in school, which does not mean teaching through games. It means a stronger focus on playing with ideas, as well as with one's hands, in order to bring out the intrinsic value and enjoyment of learning. It means viewing the curriculum as essentially a series of jungle-gyms, and teaching as the activity of seducing children into playing on them.36

While play has the capacity of motivating and whetting the appetite to learn, work adds structure and form to these sprouting ideas and

talents. Work, then, must follow play, giving direction to the child's energies and thoughts. Without work, play loses its value, and the classroom may become anarchic. After a child works on some task for a period of time commensurate with his cognitive abilities and maturity, play again is needed to revitalize the child's creativity. When seen in this manner, work and play in the classroom compliment one another; they slide into each other and together promote the healthy growth of the child.

Perhaps a brief example of this process will make the preceeding theory more concrete. Recently, I worked with a group of fourth graders who were adding drops of colored water into vials containing varying amounts of salt and water. Although I provided the materials for the children, I encouraged them to "mess around" with the colors and vials of water, and I placed no restrictions on what they could do, nor did I limit their explorations only to the materials at hand. On their own, they "re-invented" several basic scientific principles including volume (the colored water floated on the salt water) and viscosity. More important, they created many new questions that they shared with each other and with me. Once these questions were articulated, we worked at solving them. Thus play freed these children's imaginations, allowing them to understand scientific principles and to develop their own questions. This might not have occured had I been teaching this in the traditional knowledge depository manner, or as Freire calls it, the "banking" approach where facts are deposited into the children and all activity eminates from the teacher's directions.

The dynamics of work and play in the classroom and their fusion need further investigation because they may provide a positive force

that can transform the "factory" classroom into one that cherishes human strengths and frailties. Macroscopic sociological theorists must also become aware of the power play may have in helping children not only to cope with, but change a work structure that is highly alienating and debilitating. No longer can we equate the school with the factory and say our task as sociologists in understanding the school is nearly complete. The dynamics of work and play as a new field of inquiry provides a fertile, almost untouched area for extensive investigation, and the new knowledge we glean may, in fact, restore our faith in the power of schools to promote a better life for our children.

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas Green, Work, Leisure, and the American Schools (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 65.

2. Ibid., p. 66.

3. Ibid., pp. 67-68.

4. See, for example, Thomas Green, Work, Leisure, and theAmerican Schools, pp. 147-168; Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World, (New York: Basic Books, 1977), Chapter 1.

5. Green, p. 149.

6. Francis Hearn, "Toward a Critical Theory of Play," Telos, vol. 9 (Winter 1976-1977): 153.

7. Ibid., p. 154.

8. David Cohen and Marvin Lazerson, "Education and the Corporate Order," Power and Ideology in America, ed. by Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 373.

9. Christopher Lasch, Haven in a Heartless World, (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 7.

10. Cohen, p. 374.

11. Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey, Power and Ideology in Education, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp33-34.

12. Ralph Miller, "The Dubious Case for Metaphors," Educational Theory, vol. 26, (Spring 1976): 179.

13. Martin Carnoy and Henry Levin, The Limits of Educational Reform, (New York: David McKay Company, 1976), p. 76.

14. Karabel, p. 34.

15. Kathleen Wilcox and Pia Moriarty, "Schooling and Work: Social Constraints on Equal Educational Opportunity," Social Problems, vol. 24 (December 1976): 210.

16. Wilcox, p. 212.

17. Neo-Weberian theory emphasizes the power elite groups maintain in fashioning the schools to suit their own purposes.

18. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, Worlds Apart, (New York: Basic Books, 1978), p. 24.

19. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

20. Karabel, p. 35.

21. Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 127 and 141.

22. Lasch, p. 18.

23. Lasch, p. 19.

24. Lasch, p. 4.

25. Cohen, pp. 378-379.

26. Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, (New York: Vintage Press, 1962), p. 374.

27. For further explication of the relationship between schooling and democracy see John Dewey, Democracy and Education, (New York: 1966 edition), Chapter 15.

28. Cohen, pp. 379-380.

29. Hearn, p. 145.

30. Erik Erikson, "Play and Actuality," Play and Development, ed. by Maria W. Piers, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1972), pp. 130-131.

31. Erikson, p. 132.

32. Erikson, p. 172.

33. Beatrice B. Whiting and John W. Whiting, Children of Six Cultures A Psycho-Cultural Analysis, (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975), pp. 106-107 and 178.

34. Green, p. 158.

35. Margaret Mead, Culture and Commitment, (New York: Doubleday & Co. 1970), pp. 93-95.

36. Green, p. 160

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benedict, Ruth. "Continuities and Discontinuities in Cultural Conditioning," Psychiatry, vol. 1 (May 1938).

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carnoy, Martin and Henry Levin. The Limits of Educational Reform. New York: David McKay Co, 1976.

Cohen, David and Marvin Lazerson. "Education and the Corporate Order," Power and Ideology in Education, ed. by Jerome Karabel and A. H. Halsey. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Cremin, Lawrence. The Transformation of the School. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1962.

Entwistle, Harold. "Antonio Gramsci and the School as Hegemonic," Educational Theory, vol. 28 (Winter 1978).

Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1950.

Erikson, Erik. "Play and Actuality," Play and Development, ed. by Maria W. Piers. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.

Green, Thomas. "Schools and Communities: A Look Forward," Harvard Educational Review, vol. 39 (1969).

Green, Thomas. Work, Leisure, and the American Schools. New York: Random House, 1968.

Halsey, A. H. ed. Education, Economy, and Society. New York: MacMillan Co, 1961.

Harris, Adrienne and Edward Shorter. "Beseiging Lasch," Theory and Society, vol. 6 (1978).

Hawkins, David. "Messing Around in Science," The ESS Reader. Newton: Elem. Science Society of Educational Development Center, 197

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Hearn, Francis. "Toward A Critical Theory of Play," Telos, vol. 9 (Winter 1976-1977).

Hurn, Christopher. The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Karabel, Jerome and A. H. Halsey. Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

La Brecque, Richard. "The Correspondence Theory," Educational Theory, vol. 28 (1978).

Lasch, Christopher. Haven in a Heartless World. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lazerson, Marvin. Origin of the Urban Schools. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Leacock, Eleanor Burke. Teaching and Learning in City Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1969.

Lightfoot, Sara Lawrence. Worlds Apart. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Mead, Margaret. Culture and Commitment. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

Miller, Ralph. "The Dubious Case for Metaphors," Educational Theory, vol. 26 (Spring 1976).

Whiting, Beatrice and John Whiting. Children of Six Cultures: A Psycho-Cultural Analysis. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975.

Wilcox, Kathleen and Pia Moriarty. "Schooling and Work: Social Constraints on Equal Educational Opportunity," Social Problems, vol. 24 (December 1976).

Young, Michael and Geoff Whitty. Society, State, and Schooling. Ringmer England: Falman Press, 1977.